

REMARKS

Applicant's attorney wishes to thank Examiner Noguerola for the courtesies extended during the two telephone interview of January 9, 2004.

Claims 1-13 currently appear in this application. The Office Action of October 6, 2003, has been carefully studied. These claims define novel and unobvious subject matter under Sections 102 and 103 of 35 U.S.C., and therefore should be allowed. Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration, entry of the present amendment, and formal allowance of the claims.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 7 has been deemed to be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection sunder 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as set forth in the Office Action of October 6, 2003. Since claims 8-12 depend from claim 7, it is assumed that claims 8-12 are also allowable.

Additionally, following the telephone interview of January 9, 2004, claim 1 has been amended to include the allowable subject matter, namely, a plurality of ion-selective electrodes and probes configured in a single flow train and a recirculating pump for optionally recirculating the samples

and reagents. It is believed that adding these limitations to claim 1 will be sufficient to overcome the cited references.

Drawings

The Examiner has objected to the drawings because they are said to include "the following references signs not mentioned in the description...", and refers to page 12 of the specification.

The Examiner has not listed the reference signs which allegedly are not mentioned in the specification. Without knowing which reference signs are missing from the specification, it is impossible to amend the specification to include the reference signs in the description. It is respectfully submitted that all of the reference signs in Figure 2, namely, 200-212, are all described on page 12 of the specification as filed.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because "rising" should be - rinsing--.

The present amendment corrects this self-evident typographical error.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 112

Claims 1-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. The claims have been amended in accordance with the Examiner's helpful suggestions. It is believed that claims 1-12 now conform to all of the requirements of 35 U.S.C. 112.

Art Rejections

Claims 1, 2 and 4-6 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Fukunaga et al. in view of Guruswamy, Blumenthal et al., Wong et al., and Parris.

This rejection is respectfully traversed. Claim 1 has been amended to recite that the system for monitoring water quality comprises a plurality of ion-selective electrodes and probes configured in a single flow train. It is believed that this requirement in claim 1 is sufficient to overcome the cited art, none of which discloses a process occurring in such a configuration.

Appln. No. 09/881,243
Amd. dated January 16, 2004
Reply to Office Action of July 25, 2003

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted
that the claims are now in condition for allowance, and
favorable action thereon is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant

By



Anne M. Kornblau

Registration No. 25,884

AMK:ft

Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\U\Usge\Smith10\PTO\14Jan04AMDFORMAT.doc